

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11 and 14-31 are currently pending in the application. Claims 25-31 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Claim 20 has been amended to eliminate the term "conventional", as objected to by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus requested.

Claims 1, 5, 21, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent 5,882,517, to Chen et al. (Chen), in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,753,728, to VanderBilt et al. (VanderBilt). Claims 1, 3-11 and 14-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication No. 10-85729 (JP '729) in view of Chen and VanderBilt.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 3-11 and 14-24 is requested.

The Examiner's art rejection is based on a reading of the claims whereby the claimed first and second particulate active carbon particles are not required to be different in size. In the prior Action, the Examiner indicated that the claims would be allowed if it is clarified that the first particulate active carbon is capable of passing through a mesh of 60, but not capable of passing through a mesh larger than 100, with the second particulate carbon capable of passing through a mesh of larger than 100.

This specific language has been added to claim 1, with language consistent therewith added to the specification on pages 16 and 17 for clear antecedent basis. It is noted, as explained in the remarks attendant the August 18, 2005 Amendment, that one skilled in this art would understand the language "capable of passing through a mesh of 60-100" to mean that particles are capable of passing through a mesh of 60 but not

capable of passing through a mesh of larger than 100. Consequently, this clarification does not introduce new matter.

Also, it is noted that in the absence of there being a distinction between the particle sizes for the first and second particulate carbon, the language in the specification would otherwise be meaningless in distinguishing the two different particle sizes. Thus, this particle size distinction is inherently disclosed on the original form of the application.

Entry of the amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 3-11, 14-24, and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: Dec 5, 2005